



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the book should prove a great success. Its general point of view, of course, is that of the historical school, and the author's conclusions, in so far as they are indicated, are of the cautious type represented by such scholars as Driver and the contributors to Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. But the critical literature so abundantly cited, if used by the inquiring reader, will bring him into touch with every shade of opinion.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A NEW TEXTUAL CRITICISM

To devote the first of three lectures on textual criticism¹ to an attack upon the modern historical interpretation of the Old Testament seems at first sight a strange procedure. But it becomes explicable when it appears that the lecturer's theory of textual criticism involves the claim that Abraham brought his biography with him from Babylonia already written up in cuneiform characters, and that Moses wrote the entire Hexateuch, using such sources as were available and employing the cuneiform script. Concerning the post-Mosaic books Naville can only conjecture that such books as Joshua, Judges, and Samuel were written in cuneiform, while the later books were prevailing in Aramaic, though the prophets occasionally resorted to cuneiform when they had something particularly important to say. It was Ezra's task to translate the cuneiform documents into Aramaic. Last of all, about the beginning of the Christian era, the rabbis, in order to make a sharp distinction between the Jewish and Samaritan Scriptures, created the square script and turned the Aramaic Scriptures into the Jewish idiom, viz., Hebrew, which now for the first time became a written language.

This strange view is not altogether new. Professor Naville himself has written on it before, and he gives credit to Conder, Sayce, Philippe Berger, and Jeremias as his predecessors on this path. But he carries it out in greater detail and to further conclusions than heretofore. The result is a structure worthy of all praise as a work of the imagination. We can hardly accept it, however, as a piece of serious historical reconstruction. It can scarcely be expected that Professor Naville in one brief lecture should sweep away the labors of the scholars of half a century and rehabilitate Moses as the author of the Pentateuch. As a matter of fact, the considerations emphasized in Lecture I have been weighed again and again and found

¹ *The Text of the Old Testament*. (The Schweich Lectures, 1915.) By Edouard Naville. London: Oxford University Press, 1916. viii+82 pages. 3s.

wanting. If Moses did not write the Pentateuch, it is of course gratuitous to say that he did not write it in cuneiform. In any case, one may wonder where Moses, whose legislative activity was all exercised in the desert, succeeded in finding the clay for his cuneiform tablets. Again, if the Pentateuch was written on cuneiform tablets, why is the specific term for "tablet," viz., לִיָּתָה, used only in connection with the stone tablets of the Decalogue? Elsewhere in the Pentateuch the law of Moses is described as written in a סֵפֶר. This term is used in Jer., chap. 36, in connection with מִגִּלָּתָה, "the roll of the book." Cuneiform tablets were never rolled up. In the story of Jeremiah's purchase of a field (Jer., chap. 32) סֵפֶר denotes the title-deed, and the record at first sight reads very much as if that deed were written on a clay tablet. But, on the other hand, every statement made in the record is equally well satisfied on the supposition that papyrus was used. It is sound philology to hold that סֵפֶר means the same thing in similar contexts everywhere, until we have definite proof of the existence of another meaning.

As to the second claim, that the prophets wrote in Aramaic and that Hebrew did not arise as a literary tongue till about the first Christian century, space forbids adequate discussion. That such a radical change in the language of Scripture as this, at so late a date, should have escaped mention in any literature would be almost unbelievable. Further, that Hebrew should have been the dialect spoken only around Jerusalem is more easily alleged than proved. Indeed, Dr. Naville himself refers to the Canaanite glosses in the Amarna letters as Hebrew (p. 37), and rightly so. Yet these Hebrew words and forms come from such places as Megiddo and Hazur. What then becomes of Hebrew as a local dialect of Judah? The author's attention might also be called to Breasted's article on the origins of the Phoenician alphabet, in *AJSL*, XXXII (1916), which appeared too late to be reckoned with in these lectures.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A NEW TEXTBOOK ON HEBREW RELIGION¹

This book belongs to the series of "Handbooks of Ethics and Religion," designed mainly for use as college textbooks. It is not usually the aim of such books to strike out on new and independent lines of

¹ *The Origin and Growth of the Hebrew Religion*. By Professor Henry Thatcher Fowler. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1916. xv+190 pages. \$1.00.